Daniel Rigmaiden
Agency # 10966111
CCA-CADC
PO Box 6300
Florence, AZ 85132
Telephone: none
Email: none
Daniel David Rigmaiden
Pro Se, Defendant

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

United States of America,
Plaintiff,

V.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Daniel David Rigmaiden, et al.,

Defendant.

No. CR08-814-PHX-DGC

NOTICE OF FILING AMENDED PLEADING PURSUANT TO LRCiv 15.1 AND COURT'S MAY 8, 2013 ORDER (Dkt. #1009) GRANTING Dkt. #934

Defendant, Daniel David Rigmaiden, appearing *pro se*, respectfully submits *Notice Of Filing Amended Pleading Pursuant To LRCiv 15.1 And Court's May 8, 2013 Order (Dkt. #1009) Granting Dkt. #934.* 

On May 8, 2013, the Court granted the defendant's *Motion For Leave To Amend Dkt*.

#867 First Supplement To Motion To Suppress RE: Search And Seizure Of Digital Evidence
Under N.D.Cal. Warrants Or, In The Alternative, To Dismiss The Case With Prejudice (Dkt.

#934), with an attached proposed Second Supplement To Motion To Suppress RE: Search
And Seizure Of Digital Evidence Under N.D.Cal. Warrants (Dkt. #934-1).

Pursuant to LRCiv. 15.1, the defendant was required to convert the proposed document into an actual document and "file and serve the amended pleading on all parties... within fourteen (14) days of the filing of the order granting leave to amend, unless the Court orders otherwise." *Id.* On May 22, 2013, *i.e.*, within 14 days, the defendant provided his shadow counsel's office with the required converted document to be filed. However, shadow

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

counsel's office incorrectly filed the document after making additional alterations prior to filing. See Motion To Strike Dkt. #1031 And #1032 For Improper Filing Option And Altered Document Filed Against Defendant's Instructions.

Notwithstanding the mistakes made by shadow counsel's office, the defendant complied with LRCiv. 15.1 by providing the converted proposed document for filing within the required time frame. It was shadow counsel's office that filed incorrectly (Dkt. #1031 and #1032) after making additional alterations to the document against the defendant's instruction. The defendant filed a motion to strike Dkt. #1031 and #1032 as soon as he realized the error.

This notice serves to update the record as to why the proper document is only now being filed in the proper manner (i.e., after the 14-day time frame designated in LRCiv. 15.1). If the *pro se* incarcerated defendant had access to PACER then these mistakes would not occur.

This notice was drafted by the *pro se* defendant, however, he authorizes his shadow counsel, Philip Seplow, to file this notice on his behalf using the ECF system.

It is not expected that excludable delay under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h) will occur as a result of this notice.

///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1	Respectfully Submitted:
2	
3 4	PHILIP SEPLOW, Shadow Counsel, on behalf of DANIEL DAVID RIGMAIDEN, Pro Se Defendant:
5	
6	s/ Philip Seplow
7	Philip Seplow Shadow Counsel for Defendant.
8	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
9	
10	I hereby certify that on: I caused the attached document to be
11	electronically transmitted to the Clerk's Office using the ECF system for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:
12	
13	Taylor W. Fox, PC
14	Counsel for defendant Ransom Carter 2 North Central Ave., Suite 735
15	Phoenix, AZ 85004
16	Frederick A. Battista
17	Assistant United States Attorney Two Renaissance Square
18	40 North Central Ave., Suite 1200
19	Phoenix, AZ 85004
20	Peter S. Sexton Assistant United States Attorney
21	Two Renaissance Square
22	40 North Central Ave., Suite 1200 Phoenix, AZ 85004
23	
24	James R. Knapp Assistant United States Attorney
25	Two Renaissance Square
26	40 North Central Ave., Suite 1200 Phoenix, AZ 85004
27	
28	By: s/ Daniel Colmerauer (Authorized agent of Philip A. Seplow, Shadow Counsel for Defendant; See ECF Proc. I(D) and II(D)(3))
	- 3 -